APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,877	12/21/2001	Hung-Liang Chin	CHIN3013/EM	4631

23364	7590	09/23/2005

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
WILLETT, STEPHAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/023,877	CHIN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephan F. Willett	2142	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>5/25/05</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1 and 4-7</u> is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1 and 4-7</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 103

1.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the

claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various

claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any

evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out

the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103□

and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section
> 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the
> subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill
> in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 4-1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Win et al.

with Patent Number 6,453.353 in view of Garretson with Pub. No.: US 2001/0047306.

1.   Regarding claim(s) 1, Win teaches user access levels to specific data. Win teaches while

a master server of a manufacturer as "services accessible", col. 22, lines 8-10 and col. 1, lines 49-

52 and a client that belongs to a cooperating company as "inventory systems", col. 1, line 48-51

of "suppliers and partners" and as "Price List and New Product Resources", col. 5, lines 47-48

that updates, col. 7, lines 61-62 data "automatically", col. 2, lines 37-38. Win teaches while a

client logs, col. 6, lines 1-3 on, executing an authentication routine based on input to determine

an authorization level, col. 5, line 44. Win teaches based on the authorization level collecting

web pages from master servers and clients, col. 24, lines 17-18 the client is permitted to browse,

col. 6, lines 58-65 and edit, col. 12, line 6. Win teaches displaying the page of a specific screen

model, col. 6, lines 63-65, col. 9, lines 4-7. Win teaches the web page containing information

based on roles such as good transactions, col. 5, line 26, finances, line 43, and production and

materials, lines 41-42. Win teaches directly accessing the web server, col. 6, lines 3-9 without

further authentication, col. 5-6, lines 66-1; col. 6, lines 13-16; "no additional login is required to

access additional resources", col. 11-12, lines 66-1; col. 14, lines 61-64; "one-time password

card", col. 17, lines 34-37. Win teaches command inputs of ID and verification numbers, col. 6,

line 3 which is matched with database records, col. 6, lines 42-44; col. 7, lines 1-2, and the

collection of web pages based on said authorization level, col. 6, lines 58-65. Win teaches the

invention in the above claim(s) except for explicitly teaching goods transaction information

derived from financial management, production management, and materials management data

are automatically updated between the master server and the slave server. In that Win operates

to pass data securely, the artisan would have looked to the network server arts for details of

implementing server updates. In that art, Garretson, a related server merchant system, teaches

"three servers are maintained", para. 0025, line 3 in order to provide relevant goods transaction

data, para. 0027. Garretson specifically teaches "the database server is accessed the web

server[master server] ... the database server is coupled to an individual store server[slave server],

and maintains a database", para. 0028, lines 8-9, thus data is shared between the two servers via

a database server as shown by "the inventory change is provided to both the store server[slave]

and the update terminal", para. 0032, lines 20-21 and the store server is web based, para. 0006,

lines 3-9 and para. 0029, lines 1-3. Further, Garretson suggests slave server "change[s] ... are provided by the update terminal", para. 0028, lines 13-14 and "the database server is continually updated to reflect current data", para. 0010, lines 2-3 which will result from implementing his updates. The motivation to incorporate server updates between the master server and the slave server insures that data shared between servers are both accurate. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the server updates as taught in Garretson into the access authorization described in the Win patent because Win operates with client/partner data authorizations and Garretson suggests that optimization can be obtained when updating data relating to goods in connected servers. Therefore, by the above rational, the above claim(s) are rejected.

1.   Regarding claim(s) 4, Win teaches an identification and authorization comparison table, col. 22, line 48 with IDs and names, col. 6, line 3 and verification numbers as "encrypted formats", col. 6, line 62 and col. 22 49 and col. 7, line 51. Win teaches a group and authorization comparison table consisting of group names and user names and IDs, col. 5, lines 33-38, all which connect or match with web page names of URLs, col. 5, lines 19-20, 60-62.

2.   Regarding claim(s) 5, Win teaches searching for ID by group and groups for ID, col. 8, lines 51-54; col. 15, lines 21-44 and then accessing and displaying said requested web pages, col. 6, lines 63-65, col.. 9, lines 4-7.

3.   Regarding claim(s) 6, Win teaches when incorrect Ids are input, requesting the client to once again output Ids as an "error", col. 9, lines 57-61.

4.   Regarding claim(s) 7, Win teaches a specific screen model, col. 6, lines 63-65, col.. 9,

lines 4-7. web page names and connection sites or URLs and/or hyperlinks, col. 8, lines 7-12;

col. 11, lines 57-59.

Response to Amendment

4.   The broad claim language used is interpreted on its face and based on this interpretation

the claims have been rejected.

1.   The limited structure claimed, without more functional language, reads on the references

provided. Thus, Applicant's arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

2.   Applicant suggests "without further authentication", Paper Filed 5/25/05, Page 6, lines

25-26. "[The] specification, having described the whole, necessarily described the part

remaining", In re Johnson, 558 F.2d 1008, 1019, 194 USPQ 187, 196 (CCPA 1977), see also Ex

parte Grasselli, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983) and "negative limitations extended to define the

invention in terms of what it was not, rather than pointing out the invention", MPEP 2172.05(I).

A negative type limitation, that implicitly teaches other related parts remaining, to avoid obvious

elements of a reference does not exude novelty of the whole. In addition, Win teaches "no

additional login is required to access additional resources", col. 11-12, lines 66-1 and "one-time

password card", col. 17, lines 34-37. The references should not be read in a vacuum, the

teachings are not mutually exclusive, and must be taken in context of what was reasonable based

on the subject matter as a whole as would have been understood at the time the invention was

made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. The

descriptions in the references are not obfuscated by the numerous other suggested usages of said

description in the reference.   In addition, implicitly, impliedly and inferentially, various

authorization techniques are taught and language identical or verbatim is not required in an

obvious rejection.   Note that reasonable "inferences", and "common sense" may be considered

in formulating rejections for obviousness.   Specifically, *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 159 USPQ

342, 344 (CCPA 1968) states "in considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take

into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled

in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." Also, *In re Bozek*, 416 F.2d 738,

163 USPQ 545, 549 (CCPA 1969) states that obviousness may be concluded from "common

knowledge and common sense of the person of ordinary skill in the art without any specific hint

or suggestion in a particular reference". Additionally, see *In re Gauerke*, 24 CCPA 725, 86 F.2d

330, 31 USPQ 330, 333 (CCPA 1936), and *In re Libby*, 45 CCPA 944, 255 F.2d 412, 118 USPQ

94, 96 (CCPA 1958), and *In re Jacoby*, 309 F.2d 738, 125 USPQ 317, 319 (CCPA 1962), and *In*

re Wiggins, 488 F.2d 538, 543, 1979 USPQ 421, 424 (CCPA 1973). Thus, Applicant's

arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

Conclusion

5.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure is disclosed in the Notice of References Cited. A close review of the references is

suggested. A close review of the Snavely reference with Patent Number 6,772,167 and Sampson

reference with Patent Number 6,490,624 are suggested. The other references cited teach

numerous other ways to limit access to web pages via single log in, thus a close review of them

is suggested.

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

6.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Stephan Willett whose telephone number is (571)272-3890. The

examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

8.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Andrew Caldwell, can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703)872-9306.

9.   Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571)272-2100.

sfw

September 18, 2005

**ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**